

S/N 10/736,027

Response to Final Office Action Dated 7/20/2005

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.  
Claims 2 and 11 are pending in this application.

**Claim Amendments**

Claims 2-5, 11-14 were previously pending.

Claims 2 and 11 are amended.

Claims 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, and 14 are canceled.

No new claims are added.

Pending claims: 2 and 11.

**Rejection of the Claims****Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 2-5 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,887,730 to St. George ("the St. George reference" or "St. George") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,212,973 to van Staden et al. (the "van Staden reference").

Claims 3, 4, 5 and claims 12, 13, 14 have been canceled, so the rejection of these claims is no longer at issue.

**Claims 2 and 11**

Claims 2 and 11 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. The amendments do not add new matter, but rather recite elements and features of the subject matter that are either clearly visible in Applicant's figures or described in text or both.

S/N 10/736,027

Response to Final Office Action Dated 7/20/2005

Applicant's claim 2, as amended, defines a secure firearm display that includes:

a rigid restraint for holding the firearm around a breech of the firearm, such that at least 60% of a circumference of the breech is surrounded by corresponding parts of the restraint at substantially equal distances of approximately 3 millimeters or less between each part of the surrounded breech and corresponding parts of the restraint;

wherein the restraint is insertable through a trigger guard of the firearm, such that a curvature of the restraint avoids a trigger of the firearm, avoids a trigger guard of the firearm, avoids a bolt of the firearm, avoids a gunsight of the firearm, and avoids an optical scope of the firearm; and

a face plate for securing two ends of the restraint to the face plate on a side of the firearm substantially opposite the at least 60% of the surrounded circumference of the breech;

a wall plate for slidingly securing the face plate to the wall plate, wherein the wall plate is capable of being fixed to a wall; and

a lock between the face plate and the wall plate to secure the face plate to the wall plate.

The St. George reference and the van Staden reference, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the secure firearm display defined by Applicant's claim 2 (or claim 11). For example, neither of these references teach or suggest surrounding more than half of a circumference of the breech of a firearm with a close fitting rigid piece uniquely shaped to universally avoid the protuberances of a firearm that would nullify the close fit. The prior art gun racks and locks cited by the Office do not fit particularly snugly in the application demonstrated in Applicant's figures and thus do not provide as high a level of security. As the Office points out, a lock for an automobile steering wheel fits snugly—to an automobile steering wheel—but these types of steering wheel locks are not adaptable to protect guns (without copying Applicant's subject matter) because they are not shaped to avoid gun scopes, triggers, bolts, sights, etc., while remaining snug. Applicant's subject matter exploits a feature of guns that has been nonobvious to prior art gun lock artisans. Although it

S/N 10/736,027

Response to Final Office Action Dated 7/20/2005

may require extra time, effort, money, and manufacturing resources to produce Applicant's restraining mechanism (and thus, is not an obvious course of action for gun lock artisans) Applicant's restraining mechanism snugly follows the shape of a part of firearms that almost always, universally, has constant dimensions and is clear of protuberances, i.e., that part of the breech and receiving assembly of guns around which the average human hand and fingers, in the trigger-pulling position, must fit.

With respect, Applicant suggests that due to the utility and nonobviousness of Applicant's particular restraining mechanism, claims 2 and 11 should be allowable over the cited art.

*Regarding the Propriety of Entry of this Response Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116*

This Response addresses the Office Action's request in a manner which is believed to require only a cursory review by the Examiner. For this reason, entry of this Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 (and MPEP § 714.13) is appropriate and is respectfully requested.

S/N 10/736,027


Response to Final Office Action Dated 7/20/2005

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully suggests that claims 2 and 11 are in condition for allowance and requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 9-14-05

By:   
Lee & Hayes PLLC  
Mark C. Farrell  
Reg. No. 45,988  
(509) 324-9256